

Over the past months the Christian Democrats have passed resolutions condemning the European Monetary Fund, have accused Schmidt of tolerating the "self-Finlandization" of West Germany, and have launched a series of irrelevant scandals which, among other things, have obstructed the government's efforts to apprehend wanted international terrorists.

But what finally turned the stomachs of the Hesse electorate was the CDU's recent defense of the role of Israel and the fascist Lebanese Falange in the Mideast. Helmut Kohl, national chairman of the CDU, went so far as to write a letter to Schmidt accusing him of committing "genocide" against "Christians in Lebanon," because Schmidt is supporting the Syrian government with grants of development aid.

### An electorate with the long view

As an independent analyst pointed out in the newspaper *Die Welt*, it is clear that the Hesse electorate did not base their decisions on "scandals or other election tricks," but rather on the "long-term information flow" provided by Schmidt's collaborators in the SPR. Not the least of these long-

term considerations were Schmidt's pronuclear development policies. Those policies prevailed despite the strong antinuclear current existing within the SPD machine in Hesse, and the European Labor Party's vigorous campaigning for nuclear technology functioned as a crucial countervailing influence in Schmidt's favor.

Schmidt himself has laid out the two alternative political geometries that can emerge "post-Hesse." In an interview with the magazine *Stern*, Schmidt predicted that if Franz Josef Strauss goes ahead with his "fourth party" option, the splitting process within the opposition parties will not stop there. The next step, he said, would be the splitting off of the CDU's left-wing faction, modeled on any number of splinter parties that came into being during Weimar Germany.

Schmidt proposed that a more "politically hygienic" alternative would be for the opposition to lay its cards on the table and make Strauss into their candidate for Chancellor in the 1980 elections. Schmidt knows full well who would win such a contest.

—John Sigerson

## The EAP's program won in Hesse, but its votes were stolen

"The first thing you have to realize about the Hessen election, despite the obvious fact that the European Labor Party (EAP) was robbed of all but 519 votes, is that it was the EAP program of nuclear energy and the European Monetary Fund that won the vote for Schmidt's SDP," EAP chairman Helga Zepp-LaRouche said in a post-election interview Oct. 10.

"Look at how all those parties that ridiculed the EAP program lost. The CDU lost one percent of their base, their first electoral loss in Hessen since 1966. The FDP lost .6 percent of their standing, knocking them down to only 6.8 percent of the total vote. And the environmentalist parties, the wretched GLU and GAZ, together polled only 2 percent, a third of the admittedly poor showing they achieved in the Hamburg and Lower Saxony elections this summer.

"So every party that opposed the EAP program lost votes. But what happened to the EAP's votes? We got 116 in Wiesbaden, 138 in Frankfurt, 43 in Biblis — the site of the Biblis "C" nuclear reactor we campaigned for — and 37 in Darmstadt: 519 in total. Can this be the outcome of four TV and radio broadcasts, hundreds of thousands of leaflets distributed, dozens of presentations to high school classes? What about the tens of thousands of Hessen voters who purchased, and for a good price, EAP programmatic literature?

"We are already investigating several leads in this

fraud," Zepp-LaRouche said. "First of all, after similar fraud in the 1976 federal election campaign, members of the EAP executive were told by a high FDP official that although he knew for sure EAP votes were stolen, there was no way this could be proven in court.

"Second, there is a press connection. The press either ignored the EAP in the closing weeks of the election, or dismissed it as insignificant. But right after the elections, the Oct. 10 *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* — one of West Germany's most influential daily newspapers — wrote that the EAP 'was not able to convert its relatively extensive election campaign into votes.' Why would the FAZ change its opinion about our campaign from one of neglect into admitting it was 'relatively extensive' right after the voting? Isn't a good showing at the polls usually the proof of an extensive campaign?

"We also know that in the elections this August and September in America, evidence of massive vote fraud against a cothinker of ours, the U.S. Labor Party has been presented in court, specifically in Michigan, and these cases have been connected to Zionist networks that also run drugs and terrorism. In Hesse, we will be investigating Zionist networks in the trade unions, and the Willy Brandt network in the Social Democratic Party too. In the case of the opposition CDU, we will investigate the links between that party and the Black Guelph nobility still running loose in Hesse."